



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,940	04/30/2001	Jerry A. Volquardsen	P04971US0	4674

22885 7590 01/07/2005

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.  
801 GRAND AVENUE  
SUITE 3200  
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER

FISHER, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/846,940	VOLQUARDSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael J Fisher	3629	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There should be a word after the word, "said" in line 1.

Note: for examination purposes and in the interest of compact prosecution, it will be assumed that the word, 'worksheet' is the missing word.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1,4-12, 26-39,41-43 and 45-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. There is no technological innovation in the claims. As to claim 1, this could be accomplished merely by looking at a damaged car, looking at a sheet with repair estimates on it and then saying the estimate. As to claim 12, this is a trivial use of technology as the technology is not used

Art Unit: 3629

in this claim. As to claims 26 and 45, there is no technological innovation. The limitations in regard to the device in claim 25 and the "recording medium having indicia prompting a user..." in claim 45 could merely mean a pad of paper with boxes to be checked.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PAT 6,219,930 to Reid.

As to claim 1 Reid discloses a method of estimating cost of dent repair (title), which includes gathering data (inherent in that the data is gathered), processing the information according to a pre-existing estimation program (claim 1, last two paragraphs), generating an estimate of repair costs (title). Reid does not, however,

Art Unit: 3629

teach using this system for paintless dent repair (PDR). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system as disclosed by Reid for PDR as Reid teaches it as a good way to estimate the cost of dent repair and PDR is repairing dents.

As to claim 2, Reid discloses using stored digital data (col 4, lines 25-34).

As to claim 3, Reid does not teach using a global computer network. Reid does teach using computers (col 4, lines 25-34) and it is very well known in the art to connect computers to a global computer network (the Internet). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the system as disclosed by Reid by using the Internet to ease access to the information.

As to claims 4,20, Reid does not teach confirming that the damage is susceptible to PDR. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to confirm this as the system is being used for PDR and therefore, it would be inherent that the user knows if the dents can be fixed using PDR.

As to claims 5,11, the damage is dents (12, fig 1).

As to claim 6, Reid discloses characterizing the size of the dents (col 3, lines 26-31).

As to claim 7, Reid discloses identifying and characterizing clusters of dents (fig 3).

As to claims 8,21, Reid discloses confirming the cluster is contained in a predetermined area (the template) and counting the number of dents (col 3, lines 14-16).

Art Unit: 3629

As to claims 9,22, Reid discloses using the range of dent sizes and cluster information to estimate total cost of repairs for the vehicle (as discussed above, Reid discloses using dent size and cluster information and further discloses estimating cost in col 6, lines 11 and 12).

As to claims 10,23, Reid discloses manually counting damage and using that information to generate a repair estimation (claim 1).

As to claims 12,25, Reid does not teach using the Internet to request a web page hosted by a web server. Reid does teach using computers (col 4, lines 25-34) and it is very well known in the art to connect computers to a global computer network (the Internet). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the system as disclosed by Reid by using the Internet to ease access to the information and further, it is inherent that Internet sites are web pages hosted by a web server.

As to claim 13, Reid discloses completing a data input template (col 4, lines 52-54).

As to claims 14,24, Reid further discloses a computer input adapted to digitally store information about body damage (fig 5), and to generate an estimation report based on inputted data (col 4, line 67- col 5, line 2).

As to claim 15, Reid does not, however, disclose two computers, Reid discloses only one computer. As is well settle in case law, duplication of parts is well within purview of one of ordinary skill in the art (see *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc.* 193 USPQ 8,11 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977)). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3629

ordinary skill in the art to use two computers to have a central storage of information to reduce the chance of losing data.

As to claim 16, the template has indicia to prompt recordation of certain information (col 4, lines 3-4).

As to claim 17, the worksheet is physical.

As to claim 18, as best understood, and 19, the worksheet is shown to be on displayable on a computer (col 4, lines 30-34).

As to claim 26, Reid discloses a hand carryable and manipulatable device (template) which has a length, width and thickness (as is inherent in three dimensional objects), a plurality of openings in the device (fig 3). Reid does not, however, teach using this system for paintless dent repair (PDR). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the system as disclosed by Reid for PDR as Reid teaches it as a good way to estimate the cost of dent repair and PDR is repairing dents Further, Reid discloses gauging the size of the dents (col 4, lines 13-18) and further, if the system is to be used for PDR it would be inherent that the dents are identified as being proper for PDR and not too small or too large.

As to claim 27, the device is shown as a sheet of material (col 3, lines 57-59).

As to claim 28, it is shown to be flexible (col 3, lines 57-59).

As to claims 29 and 30, the make up of the template is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use paper, or laminated paper, to make the template as this would be inexpensive and would not make losing a template too costly.

Art Unit: 3629

As to claim 31, the template is shown to be plastic (col 3, lines 8-9).

As to claims 32,46, the make up of the template is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use regular, letter-sized paper, as this is cheap and abundant.

As to claim 33, Reid discloses indicia identifying the plurality of openings (54).

As to claim 34, it would be inherent that areas are arranged next to each other and that the next area would be closest to the preceding.

As to claim 35, the size of the openings is considered to be an obvious matter of design choice (In re Rose, 105 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965)) and therefor is not considered to be patentably distinct.

As to claims 36,27, Reid discloses an opening larger than the other openings (fig 2 compared to fig 3).

As to claim 37, Reid discloses using a representative area to estimate total dents (col 3, lines 18-25).

As to claim 38, Reid discloses the dents as being hail damage (col 2, lines 59-61).

As to claim 39, the template would project the openings onto a vehicle (by placing it on the vehicle).

As to claim 40, Reid discloses the device as using light (scanner 60).

As to claim 41, the device is a plurality of devices (templates) each with openings (figs 2 and 3).



Art Unit: 3629

As to claim 42, Reid does not teach adjustable openings. Reid does teach a need for different sized openings (col 4, lines 13-18), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have adjustable openings in a template that is not transparent, as in that example, as Reid discloses templates that are not transparent (fig 3), and Reid further discloses needing to know the various sizes of the dents.

As to claim 43, Reid discloses a worksheet (equations at col 5, lines 50-56).

As to claim 44, the worksheet could be electronic (col 36-41).

As to claim 45, Reid further discloses a recording medium (computer and scanner) having indicia prompting a user to record a set of identifying information about the vehicle (this would be inherent as the computer would need to know which car was being scanned) and further, a set of information about the damage to the vehicle (dent size and number).

As to claim 48, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an instruction sheet so the user could know how to use the template properly.

As to claim 49, Reid discloses providing a plurality of dent estimation methods (equations, col 5, lines 50-55).

As to claim 50, Reid discloses counting dents using the templates (claim 1).

As to claim 51, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to get clients to use the system as taught by Reid as Reid shows it as a good way to estimate damage and businesses require clients. Further, it would be inherent that the access to the information would be dependent on a level of authorization (whether allowed or not allowed.).

Art Unit: 3629

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J Fisher whose telephone number is 703-306-5993. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30am-5:00pm alt Fri. off.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael J. Fisher



Patent Examiner  
GAU 3629

MF   
12/11/04